

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 13 and 15 and leaves claims 14, 16 and 17 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 13-17.

The disclosure stands objected to being that the reference to the parent application requires updating so as to indicate that the parent application issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,275,494. An amendment was made to the specification to update this information. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The specification also stands objected to being that the Examiner alleges that the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. The present specification is a Substitute Specification which entered various amendments made to the specification during the prosecution of the parent application. The amendments made to the specification during prosecution of the parent application corrects minor errors grammatical and editorial in nature discovered upon review. Accordingly, the present specification has in fact been reviewed to determine the presence of all possible minor errors and as such clearly describes the features of the present invention. Therefore, this objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn. The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to identify any errors the Examiner may be aware of so that amendments can be immediately made to correct such errors.

Claims 13-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Laubach (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,806). This rejection is traversed for the following

reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 13-17 are not taught or suggested by Laubach whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a method of switching Internet Protocol (IP) packets at a packet switching system. Particularly, according to the present invention a pair of an IP address and a port number and transmission control protocol (TCP) or user datagram protocol (UDP) are allocated to a virtual channel identifier (VCI) and IP packets whose headers have the IP address and the port number are output via a virtual connection (VC) corresponding to the VCI when the packet switching system receives the IP packets.

According to the present invention, if the IP packet headers have a certain part identical with previously input IP packets, then the allocated VCI is the same as VC allocate to the previously inputted IP packets and if the certain part of the IP packet header is different from the previously inputted IP packets, then the allocated VCI is an idle VCI.

Another feature of the present invention is that instead of allocating a pair of an IP address and a port number in TCP or UDP to a VCI a pair of IP address, information for identifying an application are allocated to a VCI.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are described, for example, in the passage of the present application beginning on page 19, line 4 through page 22, line 9.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Laubach whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Laubach describes a method of allocating a VC based on IP address and a port number. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 10, lines 10-34, col. 12, lines 30-50 and the passage beginning on col. 12, line 63 through col. 13, line 20. In this column, Laubach describes the distributed hierarchy Ethernet switch which supports by directional exchange of Ethernet frames between common Ethernet interface connected to an Ethernet root controller. As taught by Laubach, the common Ethernet interface are connected to a plurality of Ethernet leaf processors and the controller is connected to a plurality of stations via a common distributed ATM network which is comprised of commonly available ATM switch interconnected via commonly available ATM links. As taught in Laubach, a virtual connection is defined to a configured uni-directional ATM cell path through the ATM network, using common ATM semantics.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Laubach. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention wherein if the IP packet headers have a certain part identical with the previously inputted IP packets, then the allocated VCI

is the same as a VCI allocated to the previously inputted IP packets. Further, Laubach does not teach or suggest that if the certain part of the IP packets headers is different from the previously IP packets then the allocated VCI is an idle VCI.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims allows for the sending and receiving of packets over ATM lines wherein the packets are switched based upon IP routing protocol. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Laubach.

Thus, Laubach fails to teach or suggest that if IP packet headers have a certain part identical with previously input IP packets, then the allocated VCI is the same as a VCI allocated to the previously input IP packets as recited in the claims.

Further, Laubach fails to teach or suggest that if the certain part of the IP packet headers is different from the previously inputted IP packet headers, then the allocated VCI is an idle VCI as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is quite clear from the above, Laubach fails to teach or suggest numerous features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 13-17 as being anticipated by Laubach is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 13-17.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 13-17 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 13-17 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.,
Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (520.36259CX1).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120